

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/729,959	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TACHIZAWA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Lakshmi S. Channavajjala	<b>Art Unit</b> 1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Lakshmi S. Channavajjala. (3) Mr. Niinaka.  
 (2) Richard Chin. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 30 May 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the specific distribution of ethoxylation as in claim 1 and its relation to the foam speed and lubricity of the composition. Discussed the unexpected results provided on pages 17 and 18 of the instant specification. Counsel explained that US 6,914,038 does not teach the claimed percentages for  $n=0$  and that EP generally teaches the broad distribution of ethoxylation as opposed to claimed ranges. Examiner will consider applicants' arguments in determining the patentability. .